

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

GENERAL LIB
UNIV. OF A
NOV 20

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. V

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 18, 1911

No. 6

(Concluded from page 34).

On pp. 17 ff. Professor Postgate argues earnestly that this drifting, this ceaseless change of language has a most serious bearing on the value of *translations*—these substitutes which we are asked to accept in lieu of the originals. Translation is the servant of literature, and fidelity, its single merit, is the virtue of a drudge. How imperfectly even this merit is forthcoming, I think everyone is aware. The best of translations are from the first but poor and inadequate reproductions, and from the hour of their making they steadily decline. As the words employed in them change their meaning and pass out of currency, they become first inadequate, next misleading, and at the last unintelligible. And then the translation may be said, without prejudice to truth, to consist of *dead language*. The words, indeed, are there, but their soul, the sense of which they were the chosen vehicles, has departed; or worse, maybe, in the dead frame has been generated alien and usurping life, the corrupter and the poisoner of intelligence.

Here we have an argument against translations of the Classics even more novel and effective than that recently advocated by Professor Yeames (*THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 4.161).

As an example of a translation in such dead language Mr. Postgate instances the Authorized Version of the Bible, characterizing it in language the reverse of that commonly applied to it; some of it will bear quoting in full (18):

It has now become in many and often most important passages, both in letter and spirit, little better than a falsification of the original. Let me take one of a sheaf of instances. In earlier English *ghost* was used, like the German *Geist*, in the senses of *breath* and *spirit*. The Authorized Version's phrase, 'He gave up the ghost', is still intelligible to many of its readers; yet it misrepresents the original, nevertheless, since it is now a strange and antiquated expression for the simple idea of 'expiring' or 'breathing one's last'. But the phrase 'Holy Ghost', for which the American members of the Revising Committee most rightly substituted 'Holy Spirit' throughout, conveys nothing to the uninstructed reader but what is either unmeaning or grotesque. And yet every week, from hundreds and thousands of pulpits and platforms, this version is still read and—save the mark!—expounded, without a word about its true character or the pitfalls with which it abounds.

I am reminded of the German Exchange Professor who would talk of the 'College Ghost' when he meant to exhort to college spirit.

Akin to the evil of these continuous 'translations' is another, according to Professor Postgate (19),

namely, the damage wrought by the dead renderings of individual words so common in our Latin Dictionaries. This leads him to ride one of his hobbies—the harm done by the "all but ineradicable belief that the English words derived from Latin are in very truth the same as the Latin ones" (19). In our country, at least, warning against such a belief is sounded often enough, at least by good teachers.

Why should we read the Classics at all (20)? In answering this question Mr. Postgate points out that in many respects modern life is not much, if at all, in advance of ancient life: by consequence the things of which the ancients wrote are not foreign to the interests and experiences of the moderns (21-22). This leads him to dwell on the debt of the modern world to Rome—in law, in medicine, in theology, nay, even in science; even now Rome has abundant power to instruct, if we would but hear.

Who that thinks for a moment can doubt that all along the road of Roman history lie lessons for us? A nation of landmen, driven by political and geographical causes to grasp at the sceptre of the seas, pitting itself against the greatest maritime power of the ancient world, against a race of merchants and mariners for many centuries, and, in spite of the efforts of the greatest military genius that history has known, emerging victorious from the terrible conflict by the force of a consummate organization, an unflinching patriotism, and an iron self-discipline; a fair and fertile peninsula denuded of its cultivation and drained of its population through the unchecked working of economic laws; a commonwealth passing through social to political disintegration with an aristocracy frivolous and luxurious, a proletariat indolent and unfit, amid a vanishing middle class; a great capital filled with aliens from every part of the globe, whose mob of pauperized sightseers was, as a rule, content to eat the bread and view the sports which its Government thought it a politic charity to bestow, but which rose in dangerous and deadly disorder when, through stress of weather or war, the cornships of Africa and Egypt failed to bring the foreign food; a class of financiers whose operations disturbed the peace of the world, as when, for example, a millionaire of the Empire provoked a rising in Britain by suddenly calling in his loans; a provincial administration which solved the problem of governing an empire over subject races without laxity and without discontent; and, lastly, the end of all, when the vast civilization, with its elaborate organization of law and order, its spacious and well-kept cities, its network of international highways and channels of

communication, was shivered to pieces by hordes of merely virile and valiant barbarians, because it had done nothing to counteract the sapping and disabling power of perpetual peace, because it preferred comfort to duty, and delegated the burden of defence. These things may a man read in the annals of Rome—"in illustri posita monumento", as its historian says—in works as far removed from the terminological inexactitudes of current politicians and the phrases, as empty as they are resonant, which call their followers to heel, as the pole-star is set above the fog, the smoke and turmoil of our Northern towns.

The author then points out (23) that after all the claims of Rome and Rome's language "do not rest in the first degree upon their antiquarian, historical, or linguistic importance . . . <but> much more upon <Latin> literature". He then cites, in translation, Livy's account of the fall of Alba Longa (1.29) and Ovid *Ars Amatoria* 1.421 ff., with the following comment (25):

Such literature surely is not dead; it is for all times surely real and alive. Because it deals, not with what is transitory, superficial, or material, but with what is permanent, essential, and spiritual; because it deals with that universal humanity which neither custom nor fashion, nor soi-disant progress can ever change, the same on the Tiber as on the Thames, the same whether those who for the moment embody it are carried in litters or conveyed in taxicabs or, it may be, on aeroplanes. Should we not say that our Scottish friends showed their insight when they named professorships of Latin professorships of 'Humanity'?

Enough has been said, it is hoped, to show the importance and interest of Professor Postgate's paper. In style the address is often curiously rough and unpolished, being far short of the excellence we expect in this domain from English scholars or from those whose primary task in life is the study of the language and literature of Greece and Rome.

C. K.

PREPARATORY CLASSICS¹

It is not my purpose to enter upon a tirade against the teaching of the Classics in the secondary schools, for I believe that they are as well taught as any of the subjects studied there. But I would like to consider the matter for a short time with you in order to see if we are doing the best that can be done, and to ask whether we can better the work in any directions.

The colleges, of course, receive pupils from many different schools, of all grades of goodness and badness. Pupils from the same class in any school differ in their ability and power of application so that it is a composite photograph of the results of previous instruction which we receive in the colleges. We must therefore look at the matter in a broad spirit and draw our inferences from the general results.

¹ This paper was read at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Princeton University, April 21, 1911.

If there is any general statement which might be said to cover all the cases which come under the observation of college teachers it is this, that the students who come to us lack *exact* knowledge of the classic languages. Now this statement is true not only with respect to students of the Classics, but also of students in all the branches which are required for entrance to college. That this is true anyone can learn by talking with any teacher, and by reading articles in periodicals devoted to teaching and school management. These articles are not written in a muck-raking spirit; for our system of education is being attacked by teachers as well as by those outside of the profession. The lack of exact knowledge is due to many causes. We Americans do not like exactness. Our humor is exaggeration; we speak in hyperbole; our language is slang. We avoid the effort which is necessary to the attainment of exactness and do not like it in others. It seems so humdrum. Further, the management of our schools is handed over to persons who do not know what education is, who are not educated themselves, who have obtained their election to office by the votes of uneducated people, who have sought the office for political preferment. Politics therefore play a large part in all matters connected with school management. Another fault with our system of education is the interference of parents with the work of the schools. They do not hold the child strictly to his work, but find all sorts of excuses for him if he does not get on well. They allow him to have his own way, to evade the more difficult studies, to shirk his work, and even to drop out altogether if he finds that school is an uphill climb, not a toboggan slide. Still another cause of the poor product of our schools is our teachers. Our many normal schools are supposed to turn out each year many persons qualified to teach, but they do not in fact do so; indeed, I do not believe that beyond a certain point anyone can be taught how to teach. The tricks of the trade are few. It is knowledge of one's subject plus experience which will make a teacher, if one is ever to be a teacher; for I believe that in large measure teachers are born and not made. Moreover teaching is not yet a profession in this country. Very, very many persons teach but a short time; their experience is therefore limited, for they teach merely until they can go into some other occupation. They do not teach long enough to learn how to do it.

All that has been said so far is merely to clear the way for the subject immediately in hand; for surely one must sit down and take account of stock before he begins any undertaking.

I have said that at the end of his preparatory course the student lacks exact knowledge of the Classics, by which I mean, of course, the student of the composite photograph, not the bright one, the

studious one, the dull one. Leaving out of account then, all that has been said above, what is the reason for this lack? It is this, that the work in the Classics has lacked a definite aim, or would it perhaps be better to say that it has had the wrong aim, for I believe that the aim of the work in the Classics has been to prepare students for college. If this is so, the aim has been wrong, because it has sought to prepare students for college, when the work should have aimed to give to all the students those benefits which are derived from a study of the Classics whether the students went on to college or not. In other words, the work of the preparatory school has been dominated by the colleges, which should not be. Now just here we fall into a dilemma, which is very much like the theological dilemma which exists between freewill and foreordination. The schools should not be dominated by the colleges, but at the same time the colleges have the right to make what demands they will for entrance. But when it is a fact that the schools are not turning out a finished product and the colleges are not getting what they seek by their present entrance requirements, it seems to be about time for the schools and colleges to get together and devise some better means for obtaining what they both desire.

Some attempt at mutual helpfulness has been made by the commission which The American Philological Association appointed to revise the college entrance requirements. The report of that commission has been made, widely discussed and even incorporated in the catalogues of some of the colleges for the past year. I have no doubt that it will be generally adopted by the colleges in the catalogues of the present year.

And yet I do not think that that report went far enough in its recommendations. While its recommendations were good as far as they went, and the literature recommended was somewhat more varied than at present read, still I believe that the amount of literature demanded is too great and too unvaried for the best results.

At this point we must try to find out what the aim of the secondary schools should be and what the colleges seek by their entrance requirements; for to my mind these two questions have the same answer.

The aim of the schools and the colleges in the teaching of the Classics is that students shall have an exact knowledge of the subject. This may sound like a truism which need not be mentioned, yet it is the very thing which the schools have missed in their effort to come up to the college requirements.

If the schools had aimed to teach students the language, the study of the Classics would not have come to be considered merely as a study preparatory for college, but it would have taken its place in the

curriculum as preparatory for life and in this wider aim would have appealed to a larger number of students and would have changed the method of teaching. The modern languages are in vogue because they are considered 'practical', and yet they are not as practical as the study of Latin. Advocates of the modern languages say that the knowledge of them will be useful in after life, but, if my own experience and observation are worth anything and the testimony of teachers of the modern languages is of any value, students do not learn by study in school to speak the modern languages. All they can possibly acquire is a reading knowledge of those languages, though, of course, they may go on afterwards to learn to speak them. This the vast majority do not do.

The study of the Classics therefore stands upon the same plane. What is gained, if gained at all, in the case of all of these languages, is a reading knowledge plus the discipline and the knowledge of human activities, past and present, which go along with the reading of the literature.

I do not need when speaking to an association of classical teachers to point out the advantages which are to be gained by the study of the Classics, or to try to prove that the study of the classic languages is of greater benefit than the study of the modern languages. Personally I would not be without the benefit which has been derived from both; for both are exceedingly valuable. I shall therefore go on to explain what I think our aim should be and the method by which it should be gained.

If the first place in consideration of the benefits to be gained thereby I would have *Latin required of all high school pupils for the first two years* of their course, for there is no study possible at their age which will train them so well in exact thought, exact expression and an exact knowledge of their own tongue. At the end of two years those who wished might drop the study and take up other things, but I would have them have at least one year of ancient history. Those who continued Latin might go on to a wider reading of the literature and the study of ancient life, with a year of ancient history like the others.

If this scheme were followed the present beginning books, which are almost all made as a preparation for the study of Caesar in the second year, would be superseded and new books would have to be produced which should have in view the preparation of the student for general reading in literature, and the reading of the second year would not be confined to the works of any one author, but would consist of short complete works and extracts. Nor do I think that a whole year should be spent on one author, but rather that the student should be given a wider knowledge of the great range of Latin literature in its many departments. A year and a half

at most should be spent on Caesar, Cicero and Vergil, and the more extensive and intensive study of these authors should be left to the college course.

Right here we can learn from the teacher of modern languages. He does not in the second year put his pupils into Schiller's *Revolt of the Netherlands*, and in the third year into Goethe's *Faust*, but he leads his pupil on from stage to stage through the easy to the more difficult, reading works suited to the student's ability and knowledge of the language. We, on the other hand, throw our pupils into highly specialized forms of literature, which deal with matters quite beyond them, so that they do not know whether what they translate makes sense or not. Now, of course, the civilization of Rome was very different from our own, but the daily life of the people and their feelings as human beings were so like our own that, if the literature were chosen properly, our pupils would find that they had much in common with the ancients and would be interested in what they read.

If but a half year were given to Caesar's *Gallic War*, Cicero's *Orations* and Vergil's *Aeneid* respectively, we should have three half years which might be given to other works of a simpler and more humanly interesting character and students would not find themselves plunged at once, after the beginning book, into a mass of ideas which they were not ready to assimilate.

In addition to the fact that too much has been required by the colleges, or, if you prefer to state it so, that the wrong requirements have been set by the colleges, one reason why the results of preparatory teaching have not been more successful is that some of us are not teachers, but hearers of recitations. We take a beginning book, show the pupils how to pronounce the letters, make a few other explanations, and then give out a lesson to be prepared at home. On the following day we take the book in hand and hear the pupil recite what he has tried to learn by himself. You know what the result is. It is just what we should have expected if we had thought about it beforehand.

Our method should be the exact opposite of this. With beginners nothing should be given out to be learned which has not been carefully gone over in class and impressed on the mind of the pupil. Otherwise the pupil will make mistakes, which it will be almost impossible to correct. My own struggle to learn the correct pronunciation of the Latin vowels was due to the fact that I was allowed to learn it incorrectly, so that, when I began to teach Latin and endeavored to teach the correct pronunciation, I could not tell which way was right unless I had the book before my eyes. If we learn anything wrong and then try to learn it right, we may get to the point where we do not know which is correct.

We should therefore be teachers, going over very carefully each lesson before it is handed over to the class. The next day the teacher should use every means at his command to imprint that lesson indelibly on the mind of the pupil. Without the book the pupil should turn Latin sentences into English, English sentences into Latin; the teacher should make new sentences which will ring the changes on the cases of nouns and adjectives, the tenses and persons of the verbs; all nouns and adjectives should be declined, everyone of them, and the blackboard should be much used. In this way the tongue, the ear and the eye will be used to imprint on the mind what is being learned.

Of course, you say at once that the classes are too large and the progress will be too slow by this method. In the case of large classes the pupils must be kept alive to assist and correct mistakes; when one pupil is reciting all the others can be learning through the ear and eye, unless they are allowed to go to sleep. Progress will be slow indeed, but it will be progress. Each day will be an advance in raising a solid foundation on which to erect the superstructure, and the pupils will not be hurried on so rapidly that they become discouraged and either fall by the way or resort to helps which will prove their ruin. Each word or syntactical principle will become a permanent possession, like the nursery rhymes which we learned in our childhood, or the date of the discovery of America, or of the Norman conquest of England, or like the spelling of English words, which we can not forget if we would. Without this firm foundation the superstructure will be a tottering building which should be condemned.

While the pupils are learning the language in this manner they will also be learning the proper method of study, the way in which to attack any new thing which they may undertake.

As soon as a sufficient advance in the knowledge of the skeleton of the language, the declensions, conjugations, the few main principles of syntax, and a small vocabulary, has been gained, a book of easy stories should be taken up, and the same method followed as before, the advantage of this book being that here the pupil meets the language used in description and connected narrative. He can be taught what a sentence is, and the relation of sentences to one another in connected description. He must read everything aloud, write from dictation, learn much by heart, of course with the correct pronunciation, and must be forced to make his translation in good English, which will be one of the best methods of teaching him his own language. New principles of syntax must be explained as they occur and the pupil will come to see what the rules in the grammar mean, when he meets in his reading the syntactical forms on which the rules are based.

After a year of such thorough drill and a second year of reading the pupil will have gained a good understanding of the language, if he is ever to understand it at all. He will also have obtained a large amount of mental training, and will be in a position to decide whether he will go on with further reading or turn his attention to something else. If he wishes to take up modern languages, the teacher of those languages will welcome him with open arms, because he will be able to do in two years what he would take three or four to do if he had not had this preparation in Latin.

What has been said respecting the teaching of Latin applies with equal force to the teaching of Greek, but what has been said concerning the literature read in Latin applies with greater force to the Greek read in the preparatory school. Xenophon has written much more interesting and instructive things than his *Anabasis*, and as to Homer, I think it almost suicidal to put our pupils in the third year into the *Iliad*. The dialect confuses the small knowledge which the student already has of Greek, and the vocabulary is very different from that of prose. If there is not enough written in Attic to occupy the student's attention, Herodotus should be the bridge by which he is carried over to the study of Homer. But there is literature enough fully to occupy the student's time through three preparatory years without sending him to the works of the blind poet of Greece.

To make this discussion practical let us see if we can map out a tentative course for the four years of preparatory Latin and the three of preparatory Greek.

(1) *Latin*. First, a beginning book which shall acquaint the pupil with the rudiments of the language, but which shall not be a preparation for any one author. Then a book of graded anecdotes and stories, which have to do with the life of the people. Following this, longer connected passages in prose and short works of various authors, and a book of poetry culled from everywhere, the best known poems of many writers, Ovid, Martial, Catullus, Horace, Vergil, many of which poems shall be memorized by the student. Then perhaps Sallust's *Catiline* and *Jugurtha*, parts of Caesar's *Gallie War*, Cicero's *De Amicitia*, or Senectute, his letters, and orations, and then parts of Vergil's *Aeneid*.

By as much reading as possible on the basis of a good foundation, the student will acquire a knowledge of civilization, archaeology and antiquities better than he would by reading many notes in his editions of the authors and consulting dictionaries of antiquities, and the history of the people will be learned at first hand.

(2) *Greek*. The course in Greek would be carried on along the same lines, the beginning book, the book of easy graded extracts, Xenophon's *Cyropædia* and *Memorabilia*, Plato's *Dialogues*, Plutarch's

Lives, parts of Thucydides, the orations of Lysias, Lucian, Herodotus.

Are there any books now available which could be used, if such a method of teaching the Classics were introduced at once? I must confess, that I do not know any beginning book which is adapted to the method which has been outlined, but some of you are intimately connected with the teaching of beginning Latin and may be able to suggest the name of the book we want. In the matter of literature to be read there are many good books published by various houses, books which are admirably adapted to our purpose, and if the teachers called for others the publishing houses would be only too glad to furnish them.

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE HAMILTON FORD ALLEN.

REVIEW

The Usage of *idem*, *ipse*, and Words of Related Meaning. By Clarence L. Meader (in *University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series*, Volume 3). New York: The Macmillan Co. 1910).

In this supplement to his work on *The Latin Pronouns*, Professor Meader has given us a thoroughly modern book. While confining himself to the pronouns of identity, he seeks to avoid the dangers of specialization by a careful consideration of all the available evidence from other languages and other fields of knowledge.

The semantic categories upon which the investigation is based are taken from recent works on logic. The resulting terminology is at first glance confusing to a mere linguist, but it becomes perfectly clear upon a second reading and it is never vague. If psychology is less prominent than logic, that is due to the subject matter. Professor Meader takes full account of the writings of such men as Wundt, and he makes noteworthy contributions of his own (c. p. 51).

The author says in his introduction (p. 2) that in connection with the discussion of the Latin words "attention will be called to the parallel usages of Sanskrit, Greek, German, and Old English, but with less extensive uses of Balto-Slavic, Celtic, and Iranian material". There are, however, numerous citations from Russian, Old Prussian, Old Irish, Armenian, and Modern Persian. A few references to Telugu make us wonder why we are carried so far afield and yet no farther; probably every language presents parallels, and for some of them the material is easily accessible. The results for Latin of all this comparison are less extensive than might have been expected, but it is important for our understanding of human speech in general to know that in many languages pronouns tend to develop in the same direction.

Professor Meader's collections of material are very extensive and they appear to have been made with due regard to textual questions. At many points he has been able to correct the statements of the handbooks. For example, he shows (41 ff.) that the phrase *idem ipse* is Ciceronian.

The development of *idem* into an adverb (or conjunction, as Professor Meader prefers to call it) is cleared up by the new material presented on pages 101 ff. In an article in *Classical Philology* 2. 313-323, the present reviewer discussed such uses of *idem* as the following:

CIL. 6. 589. Cn. Antonius Cn. f. Fuscus aediculam cum ara et cratera d. d. *idemque* dedicavit.

CIL. 6. 15389. Claudiae Cypare fecit Claudius Felix libertae suae piissimae *idem* coniugi. . .

CIL. 14. 2112. L. Caesennio L. f. Quir. Rufo dict (atore) III *idemq(ue)* patr(ono). . .

In all of these inscriptions *idem* is employed to indicate the identity of a concept (in these cases, a person) which appears in two different situations. From the point of view of logic they are precisely parallel. From the point of view of grammar, however, they form a series which represents the historical development of *idem* from an inflected pronoun to an indeclinable element (adverb or conjunction). In the first sentence *idem* is in agreement with *Antonius Fuscus*, the name of the man whose identity in the two situations it predicates. In the second sentence *idem* is in agreement with *Claudius Felix*, while it predicates the identity of *Claudia Cypara* in two situations (*libertae, coniugi*). In the third passage there is no word either expressed or implied with which *idem* can agree.

This simple and satisfactory account of the process was rejected in the article mentioned above because the material then at hand seemed to indicate that the second and third types belonged to two different local dialects. Professor Meader's new material shows that the simple explanation is probably the correct one.

Unfortunately, however, he fails to make the point quite clear; and for a reason that is characteristic, not of him alone, but of many of our psychological grammarians. He says (p. 99, footnote): "The general situation appears to me to be the most important factor that determines the 'meaning' of *idem*, the particular grammatical form into which they are cast appears secondary and less essential". In the case before us it is true that the general situation is the dynamic factor, the factor which induced the change. But the chief negative tendency, the chief barrier to the process was the grammatical rule of concord. Our three sentences show three successive stages in the breaking down of that barrier.

The ultimate object of grammatical study is not form or syntax or style but the linguistic consciousness which lies behind them all. But in every language the linguistic facts which are most prominent

in the minds of the speakers are just those which correspond with the grammatical categories of that language. The Latin system of concords is extremely complicated and unsatisfactory from the point of view of logic; one might perhaps think *a priori* that no such system could long hold a dominant place in the consciousness of any people. But we have before us proof that as a matter of fact it did for a long time prevail over the apparently more vital fact of parallelism in "the general situation". The reason is obvious: concord was a matter to which every speaker had to pay constant attention. Long habit compelled him to associate nominatives with nominatives, feminines with feminines, etc. The result of this and the many similar habits is that the grammatical categories represent the most important linguistic association-groups. We grammarians must not neglect them.

In other parts of his book also Professor Meader's enthusiasm for the new has led him to undervalue the old. On page 47 he takes Wagnon to task for "thinking of a word as having a meaning of its own apart from the context in which it stands; and not regarding it as a function, so to speak, of the unit of thought of which it forms a part". Now, a word really has "a meaning of its own". While its force is no doubt largely determined by the context in which it stands, its contribution to that context is no less important. The old-fashioned lexical treatment of words is justified by scientific considerations as well as by convenience.

It is well to remember that the method of philology—including grammar—is older and more highly perfected than any other method known to science. We ought to supplement it from every possible source, but there is very little of it that can safely be discarded.

Printer's errors are far too numerous in the book; there are no less than five in three lines of Latin on page 67. The author himself must be charged with various Teutonisms, and with slips like *Germanics* for *Germanic* (three times on page 48), *progenerator*, *his habitual habit*. Several sentences are ungrammatical, and many are in sad need of recasting.

BARNARD COLLEGE.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

CORRESPONDENCE

SYNTAX AND TRANSLATION

For the second-year student of Latin, syntax is merely a means to an end. However valuable the study of grammar may be in itself, the Caesar student cares for it only because it holds the key to the Latin sentence. To translate, he must know the relations of the words to one another, and to understand these relations he must give careful attention to the inflectional endings. Once the thought is fully mastered he has no further concern with the

endings and the relations they indicate, just as the man who steps off the top rung of a ladder upon the elevation he seeks has no concern with the ladder. The means are no longer of value when the end has been fully and satisfactorily achieved.

Let me not be misunderstood. I do not mean to deny that there is valuable training in the study of grammar, nor do I mean that when the sentence is once translated the student may safely forget the grammatical principles involved in it. I mean that for the pupil the justification of grammatical knowledge lies and should lie in its availability as a tool.

It follows from these considerations that grammatical distinctions which do not make a difference in the translation should be ignored. For instance, the classification of the genitive as subjective, objective, possessive, etc., is valueless to the high school student for purposes of translation. However classified, the translation of the genitive is the same, and the pupil understands the meaning perfectly without giving a thought to these names. Why distract his attention with these wholly irrelevant details?

Now, if syntax is really a means and not an end in itself, it would seem the part of wisdom for the teacher to lead the pupils to look upon it in this light. He must continually remind them that no one can be sure he understands the thought except as he attends carefully to the word forms and thinks of the relations thereby indicated. These are the essential *preliminary* steps to an understanding of the sentence.

But is this the impression given by a recitation in Latin as usually conducted? On the contrary, it would almost seem as if the teacher desired to give the opposite impression. Instead of emphasizing the fact that an understanding of forms and syntax is the *preliminary* to an understanding of the thought, in an ordinary recitation exactly the opposite is implied. A pupil is called upon to recite. He first of all translates the passage, giving, we will assume, a satisfactory version in acceptable English. Now, no matter how perfect the translation may be, no matter how clear a comprehension of the thought the pupil may evidently have, the teacher next proceeds to an examination of the syntax of the passage, as a subject of independent and later interest. Nay, question and answer in syntax seem often suggested by the translation, as if the latter led up to the former. For instance, if the pupil hesitates in naming a certain ablative construction, the teacher may ask, 'How did you translate it?' and from a consideration of his translation the pupil deduces an ablative of instrument. But surely his translating it as an ablative of instrument, his incorporating it into his English sentence so that it means what the author intended it to mean—this is worth far more than a belated tagging of the construction after he has translated it and therefore has no further use

for it. Certainly a sound pedagogical method would exactly reverse this order. It would make sure first that the pupil has a right understanding of the syntax of the sentence and then ask him, relying on this understanding, to translate it, teaching him that all this preliminary work is of value only as it leads him to a correct and adequate translation.

In my own second-year work I follow this plan: we spend the last few minutes of the recitation period studying the syntax of the morrow's lesson. I read the Latin to them, questioning them as to forms and syntax, impressing it upon them that we are preparing for a translation and that the first question is how the words fit together. It isn't enough to know that a word is in the genitive case: we must find the noun on which it depends. If the verb in an *ut*-clause is in the subjunctive mode, that is important not because it illustrates a rule in the grammar, but because it indicates a different translation from what we should have if the verb were in the indicative. Thus it is constantly drilled into the pupils that they must understand the syntax in order to translate. Questions of construction which cannot be decided offhand are left to be settled by each pupil in his private study, the aim being not to relieve the pupil of work but to train him in correct methods. Next day the pupils translate the lesson, giving their whole attention to the thought and the story, and striving for the best English at their command. I ask no questions about grammar unless the translator has made a mistake due to misapprehension of some grammatical detail, or unless some peculiar usage calls for explanation.

In order further to impress this method upon the pupils, I occasionally give written examinations upon the syntax of previously unseen passages. From these exercises and from the oral work described above, they soon learn that their instinctive impulse to turn immediately to the vocabulary when attacking new Latin may not be wise, since they can make considerable progress toward understanding the passage without looking up a word.

HIGH SCHOOL, Los Angeles. WALTER A. EDWARDS.

In a recent number of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY (5, 20-23) I reviewed certain portions of the new Companion to Latin Studies, and called attention to the fact that Professor J. E. Sandys, the author of the article on Epigraphy, in saying "no specimens of this class (*tesserae hospitales*) have been found" was probably following Professor Egbert, whose Introduction to the Study of Latin Inscriptions is the only book on the subject in English. As a matter of fact two specimens, which are now in European museums, were definitely identified in 1895 after Professor Egbert's book had gone to press. As Professor Egbert made the necessary correction in his revised edition (p. 473) it is all the more surprising that Professor Sandys should still be in need of light on this point.

HARRY L. WILSON.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, weekly, on Saturdays, from October to May inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Teachers College, 535 West 120th Street, New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the language, the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to **THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY**), are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

Outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of **The Classical Weekly** is one dollar per year.

Editor-in-Chief

GONZALES LODGE, Teachers College, Columbia University

Managing Editor

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

Associate Editors

ERNST RIESS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

HARRY L. WILSON, Johns Hopkins University

Business Manager

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, books for review, queries, etc., should be sent to the Managing Editor. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

Printed by Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

JUST PUBLISHED

Nutting's Latin Primer

By H. C. Nutting, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Latin, University of California.

50 CENTS

A book for upper grammar grades, that lays a firm foundation for further progress; gives a working vocabulary of nearly 400 words; interests the pupil in Latin as a living, rather than a dead, language; and teaches thoroughly the most fundamental constructions.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO

THE LAKE CLASSICAL SERIES

includes distinctive and progressive textbooks in Latin and Greek

Sight reading is now supplied free in the paper class texts in Latin, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee appointed by the American Philological Association and the requirements of the New York State Regents. Correspondence invited.

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

623 South Wabash Ave., Chicago 37 East 28th St., New York

D'OOGEE'S LATIN FOR BEGINNERS \$1.00

A remarkable book with a remarkable record of instant recognition.

Constructions are presented from the standpoint of English as far as possible.

The arrangement of material is logical, and fitted to the student's natural capacity.

In the vocabularies are given where possible English derivatives of the Latin word. They have proved a great help.

There are abundant exercises for translation.

There is a carefully selected and well-balanced vocabulary.

A very large percentage of the words occur five or more times in Caesar.

Never before in a Latin textbook have there been such illustrations.

GINN AND COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago London

DERIVATION OF WORDS IN LATIN

A handy and useful pamphlet for High School Classes. Price, 15 cts. (stamps not accepted).

Address the author,

A. C. RICHARDSON, 49 Fargo Ave., Buffalo, N. Y.

A LATIN GRAMMAR

By H. E. BURTON, Ph.D., Professor of Latin, Dartmouth College. 90 cents

A new grammar and the only one on the market to-day which is sufficiently clear for the beginner and also sufficiently complete and scholarly for the college student. Its live, vigorous quality makes it extremely interesting; its method of showing the relative importance of facts is very effective.

SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY

Boston New York Chicago

A HISTORY OF CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

From The Seventh Century B.C.

To

The Twentieth Century A.D.

BY

Harry Thurston Peck, Ph.D., LL.D.

Just Published

BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY,

64-66 Fifth Avenue, New York.

Price \$2.00.